Robarts conference continues to showcase best graduate research in Canadian Studies

In April 2017 the Robarts Centre for Canadian Studies hosted its annual graduate student conference. The theme for the conference was “Transgressing the Nation-State: Constructs of Canadian Identity.” The conference was held over two days and was, by all accounts, another successful event (in no small part due to the excellent organizing committee, led by acting director Anna Hudson and York graduate student Erin Yunes). In July 2015, when I took over as director of the Robarts Centre, I really wanted to bolster the profile and reputation of the Robarts Centre at York (because, let’s be honest, when most people hear the name Robarts, they still think of the library at U of T). An obvious way to do this was to promote new and cutting-edge graduate research in Canadian studies.

I recall with much fondness my own first conference experience, at the McGill Institute for the Study of Canada, when two of my best friends sat in the audience and rooted me on as I delivered...
Canada Watch Summer 2018

Transgressing the Nation-State: Constructs of Canadian Identity

FEATURES

DIRECTOR’S INTRODUCTION
Robarts conference continues to showcase best graduate research in Canadian Studies
By Gabrielle Slowey

ORGANIZERS’ INTRODUCTION
Transgressing the nation-state: Constructs of Canadian identity
By Erin Yunes and Melanie Wilmink

EDITORIAL
Why don’t they all move south?
By Joshua Stribbell

Is your name “Canadian” enough?
By Maryam Ahmad

Administering temporary foreign worker status in Canada
By Tyler Chartrand

Policing citizenship: Some reflections on immigration enforcement and sanctuary in Toronto
By Karl Gardner

Travelling with Father Morin: Missionaries, colonial projects, and the transnational core of national debates in Quebec
By Fred Burrill

From protests to pomegranates: Exploring narrative through practice-based research
By Nedda Baba

Disability policy in Canada and new funding initiatives: Innovative or opportunistic?
By Angie Conrad

Monstrous bodies, mad minds: Reading trauma through the body in Indigenous and diasporic contexts
By Angela Herring-Lauzon

Direct audience address in Cliff Cardinal’s Huff: Complicity, powerlessness, and sovereignty
By Sigry Lynch

Unsettled ground: The ruins of closed residential schools and Canadian identity
By Katherine Morton

Adam Capay: Injustice toward First Nations offenders in Canadian corrections
By Katie O’Connor

Anniversaries of denial: Canada 150 and the impacts of settler cultural policy
By Irwin Oostindie

Conceptualizing collaboration between Indigenous racialized immigrants and Aboriginal peoples
By Brenda Polar

Colonialism vs. truth and reconciliation
By Ada Uddoh

COLUMNS IN THIS ISSUE
Maryam Ahmad
Nedda Baba
Fred Burrill
Tyler Chartrand
Angie Conrad
Karl Gardner
Angela Herring-Lauzon
Anna Hudson
Signy Lynch
Katherine Morton
Katie O’Connor
Irwin Oostindie
Brenda Polar
Joshua Stribbell
Ada Uddoh

PRODUCTION
ReWords Editorial & Production Services

CONTACT FOR INFORMATION
Canada Watch
7th Floor, Kaneff Tower
4700 Keele St., Toronto, Ontario M3J 1P3
Phone 416-736-5499, Fax 416-650-8069
http://robarts.info.yorku.ca

For information regarding future issues, contact Laura Taman, Coordinator, Robarts Centre.

Please address comments to Gabrielle Slowey, Director, Robarts Centre.

Canada Watch is produced by the Robarts Centre for Canadian Studies of York University.

Copyright © 2018

Printed in Canada

ISSN 1191-7733
As we struggle with the lack of justice for Colten Boushie and Tina Fontaine, along with the numerous missing and murdered Indigenous women, there is no better time to reflect on the fact that some Canadians are confined within the constructs of Canadian identity.
Why don’t they all move south?

PROBLEM SOLVER OR OPPORTUNITY SEEKER

In 2016, I attended an exhibition hosted by Manulife called Arctic Adaptations. The evening showcased a project of the same name, which took place while Nunavut was celebrating its 15th anniversary in 2014. Participants explored innovative architecture proposals prepared by five design teams, each of which comprised “a Canadian school of architecture, a Canadian architecture office with extensive northern experience, and a Nunavut-based organization.” Each team was given a single aspect to focus on, choosing either housing, health, education, arts, or recreation in Nunavut communities. I was impressed by the presentations, as they provided suggestions for a shift from northern architecture being a “problem solver to an opportunity seeker.” Important work like this helps me believe in reconciliation. It was the attitude present in some of the attendees that discouraged me.

The guest I brought spoke Mandarin, and she acted as a translator during a conversation I shared with a group of Chinese economists. The beginning of the discussion was going smoothly enough. I was sharing the ongoing projects we have for Inuit in Toronto, as well as my limited knowledge surrounding issues facing northern communities. It was during this part of the conversation that I was asked the question, “Why don’t they all move south?” I wasn’t sure how to respond, so I remained silent as my mind scrambled to find a satisfying answer to an unexpected question. As a result, the conversation switched to Mandarin and I watched my participatory role change from an ambassador to a spectator. I asked my guest what they were saying, and she told me that they were working out the costs that would be associated with moving the entire Inuit population to Edmonton, Montreal, and Ottawa—figures that would better be discussed, in my opinion, with regard to subjects like sustainable architecture in the north (the theme of the event).

I wish I could say that this was an isolated and rare occurrence. The unfortunate reality is that it reflects a mindset that has been, and remains, a pervasive point of view tainting the relationship between Indigenous people and the rest of the country. The perspective that I’m speaking about is the terrifying and belittling belief that Indigenous people belong to the state. This belief has led to horrifying acts that have plagued our communities for hundreds of years. Residential schools, forced relocation, and the “Sixties scoop” are among these acts, and they have found their way into the public sphere largely through the voices of non-Indigenous celebrities. The fact that Gord Downie (I do want to add that I’m a huge Hip fan) has become the image for reconciliation in the eyes of a number of Canadians reflects the reality that we are seen by many as something that belongs to the state. The truth is, we can speak for ourselves, and we have been speaking this entire time. But no one has been listening.

EMPOWERMENT, NOT DEPENDENCY

When I think about reconciliation and how we need to hold the Canadian government, and by extension the Canadian population, accountable for the damage that has been done to our communities, I think in terms of creating a sense of empowerment among our people as opposed to a sense of dependency. We are entirely capable of taking care of ourselves. We did it for thousands of years before settlers arrived to claim our lands. We weren’t killing ourselves before colonization. We weren’t killing ourselves before our identity and our land were stolen from us. We didn’t choose to live in the communities we were brought to. We were placed there, by force. In northern communities, after Inuit were moved into our new settlements, the RCMP killed our dogs so that we couldn’t travel out onto the land anymore. They made us completely dependent on their resources.

What we have lost as Indigenous people throughout the history of colonization is control over our land, lives, and destinies. What we want back is sovereignty over our environment and our communities. I understand that trauma is not something that damages the victim alone, and that the abuser is also susceptible to experiencing pain. Reconciliation is a journey of healing together. It’s my hope that we can all consider what this means.
Is your name “Canadian” enough?

During the 150th anniversary of Confederation in 2017, Canadians were waving the flag high to celebrate the values and the identity that Canada aims to embody. Following the election of the Liberal government in 2015, the world was reminded of Canada’s global ambition to be a bearer of peace and a haven for refugees fleeing persecution. There are, however, internal concerns that have gone unaddressed, including missing Indigenous women, lack of infrastructure investment on reserves, and income inequality. Many of these issues stem from the deeply rooted discrimination within the fabric of Canadian society. For this reason, I began my own research into the name-based discrimination that occurs during job recruitment. Studies indicate high rates of discrimination against minority applicants.

NAME-BASED DISCRIMINATION IN JOB RECRUITMENT

While there is significant literature on workplace discrimination and racism, the study of name-based discrimination is still bourgeoning. In a 2009 study led by Philip Oreopoulos, “thousands of resumes were sent in response to online job postings across Toronto to investigate why Canadian immigrants struggle in the labour market. The findings suggested significant discrimination by name ethnicity and city of experience” (Oreopoulos & Dechief, 2011, p. 5). The study was assessed and updated in 2011, 2012, and 2017. According to the findings, discrimination is an ongoing experience of ethnic minority applicants who bear foreign-sounding names. Name-based discrimination is a continuing reality faced by ethnic minorities in Canada, regardless of their Canadian or foreign credentials. This article provides a brief overview of the studies on this topic and offers insight on how such practices have significant implications as a result of institutional and microaggressive forms of racism. It concludes by offering recommendations on employment best practices.

THE FINDINGS

In 2009, economist Philip Oreopoulos spearheaded a study titled “Why Do Skilled Immigrants Struggle in the Labor Market?” to investigate why Canadian immigrants who were given entry into Canada on the basis of skill continued to struggle in the labour market. The study sent more than a thousand resumés in response to online job postings for various types of occupations in Toronto. The resumés represented individuals from China, India, and Pakistan. The author randomized resumés on the basis of educational level, experience gained either abroad or in Toronto, and fluency in several languages. Some of the study’s main findings were that the interview request rates for English-named applicants with Canadian education and experience were three times higher than the rates for Chinese, Indian, and Pakistani applicants, and that Canadian experience was highly preferred by employers in comparison with foreign experience. Canadian applicants with English-sounding names had significantly higher callback rates than applicants with non-English-sounding names (16 percent versus 11 percent) (Oreopoulos, 2009).

Follow-up reports in 2011, 2012, and 2017, which included data from Montreal and Vancouver, found similar results. The surprising part about these findings is that some of the applicants immigrated to Canada under the points system, which prioritizes skilled workers (Oreopoulos, 2009). Thus, these findings indicate that applicants who possess the necessary qualities, but do not have English-sounding names, suffer high rates of discrimination on the basis of their ethnic identities.

THE IMPLICATIONS

The findings of these studies have far-reaching implications. First, the findings illustrate a prevalent trend of institutional racism in the labour market.1 Institutional racism is detrimental to societal progress because it disadvantages members of ethnic minorities rather than diversifies companies. This kind of disadvantage leads to a loss of talent based solely on one’s name and the perceived “burden” that employers must cope with, such as the “possibility of language problems and heavy accents” (Banerjee, Reitz, & Oreopoulos, 2017, p. 6). However, even if one were to consider slight language barriers or heavy accents as a “burden,” the burden is only marginal in comparison to the high degree of qualification that applicants possess.

These discriminatory employment practices damage both the applicants and the hiring companies because they reinforce white privilege based on names. It is particularly difficult “to control our institutions, which, being products of their history, cannot but perpetuate practices which advantage the typical white and handicap the typical minority person” (Better, 2008, p. 13). Evidently, the reinforcement of these societal and institutional practices is rooted in Canadian history.

BY MARYAM AHMAD

Maryam Ahmad is a recent graduate from the Balsillie School of International Affairs, where she completed an MA in global governance.

Name-based discrimination is a continuing reality faced by ethnic minorities in Canada, regardless of their Canadian or foreign credentials.

The findings indicate that applicants who possess the necessary qualities, but do not have English-sounding names, suffer high rates of discrimination on the basis of their ethnic identities.

1. Institutional racism is detrimental to societal progress because it disadvantages members of ethnic minorities rather than diversifies companies.
Second, these results also imply forms of microaggression\(^2\) that happen before one even enters the workplace, because there is an inherent degradation in rejecting or being less likely to contact applicants with ethnic-sounding names.

**URGENT STEPS**

Urgent steps need to be taken to combat such discriminatory and racist practices. The first step is to reform human resources management with stronger oversight to prevent discriminatory practices. Once this step is achieved, there must be serious efforts to comply with the requirements of the *Employment Equity Act*. Since most employers have voluntarily adopted the tenets of this Act, there must be a regulatory body to ensure that its provisions are properly enforced—for both large and small employers. By making these necessary changes, we will be one step closer to a more inclusive and equal Canadian society.

**NOTES**

1. Institutional racism can be defined as “those patterns, procedures, practices and policies that operate within social institutions so as to consistently penalize, disadvantage, and exploit individuals who are members of non-white/racial ethnic groups” (Better, 2008, p. 11).

2. Microaggression can be defined as “everyday exchanges that send denigrating messages to certain individuals because of their group membership (people of color, women, or LGBTs)” (Sue, 2010, p. 24).

**REFERENCES**


Administering temporary foreign worker status in Canada

NON-IMMIGRANTS

The status of “temporary foreign worker” is ascribed to migrant workers employed in Canada regardless of their long-term residency intentions or the structural permanency of migrant workers in the country’s labour market. This status shapes the experience of ever-growing numbers of workers in Canada in the 21st century and it does so increasingly outside the national scale that has traditionally framed immigration policy.

Temporary foreign worker, as a category, emerged from the exceptions created in immigration reforms following the Second World War, when it became possible to rapidly import (and deport) racialized and gendered labour in large numbers, destined for specific sectors and industries. It is worth noting that such labour has long been imported into Canada, and its predecessor colonies, according to varying justifications and economic thinking going back to the time of African slavery and Asian “coolie” indentured labour (Potts, 1990). However, it was the Immigration Act of 1952 that specifically identified a category of “non-immigrants” whose employment was permitted only temporarily and who had no right of appeal if ordered deported (s. 7(5)). The increased regulation of labour markets in the postwar era, including via the extension of labour and employment protections for national citizens, went hand in hand with emerging forms of non-citizenship being defined at that time. This non-immigrant status gave rise to several precursors of today’s programs, including the West Indian Domestics Scheme (1955), the Canadian-Jamaican Seasonal Agricultural Workers Program (1966), and the Non-Immigrant Employment Authorization Program (1973).

THE TEMPORARY FOREIGN WORKER AND INTERNATIONAL MOBILITY PROGRAMS

Today, temporary foreign worker status is granted to migrant workers under the authority of two programs: the Temporary Foreign Worker Program (TFWP) and the International Mobility Program (IMP). These programs are administered largely through controls on temporary work permits, which are issued to successful applicants at their port of entry into Canada. Temporary work permits authorize one to reside and hold employment in Canada for a finite period under a variety of conditions that may specify the employer, place of employment, occupation of employment, rate of remuneration, and other employment conditions. Between the two programs, more than half a million individuals held a valid temporary work permit in 2014 in Canada (CIC, 2015, p. 18).

The TFWP facilitates the process by which a Canadian employer hires a foreign national for temporary employment in a position that cannot be filled by a Canadian. The TFWP emerged from prior Canadian immigration programs that granted temporary work permits to foreign nationals, following the model of postwar guest worker programs in the United States and Europe. This model can be characterized by its origins in bilateral agreements negotiated with specific states and its use of a restrictive work permit and a labour market test (or certification), a determination by federal labour ministries that the hiring of foreign nationals would not unduly impact their labour markets. The TFWP took its current form in 2002-3, with the expansion of eligible occupations under the Low-Skill Pilot Program and the creation of a new agency, the Canada Border Services Agency (CBSA). Today, the TFWP is jointly administered by the CBSA, Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada (IRCC), and Employment and Social Development Canada (ESDC). Every year, tens of thousands of foreign nationals are authorized to work temporarily in Canada through this program in domains such as agriculture and domestic care work as well as other occupations (Rajkumar et al., 2012).

The IMP, the second of Canada’s two current temporary labour migration programs, facilitates temporary employment of foreign nationals under conditions set by international agreements or those that promote reciprocity or competitiveness in the global economy. The IMP was designated in 2014, when all TFWP categories exempt from a labour market test were reorganized into a separate program, but most of its elements emerged from the implementation of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) in 1994. The categories that make up the IMP can be characterized by their origins in multilateral agreements made as part of trade blocs or on conditions of reciprocity and the absence of labour market tests or overly restrictive work permits. The IMP is administered jointly by IRCC and the CBSA. Each year, it authorizes hundreds of thousands of foreign nationals to temporarily work in Canada as part of trade agreements, reciprocal youth mobility agreements, intra-company transfers, and other arrangements focused on global labour mobility.

GROWTH AND DYNAMICS IN TEMPORARY LABOUR MIGRATION TO CANADA

The most general trend in temporary labour migration to Canada is that the
number of migrants admitted as temporary foreign workers has intensified in the 21st century and reached unprecedented proportions of total immigration. Between 2003 and 2013, the number of temporary work permits issued tripled, from more than 100,000 in 2003 to more than 300,000 in 2013 (CIC, 2012, p. 62; IRCC, 2016). This growth generally aligns with global migration trends, which have seen total labour migration increase (Castles, de Haas, & Miller, 2014). Yet the growth also reflects circumstances particular to Canada. For the past decade, Canada has admitted more migrants through the temporary work permit programs than through all economic categories of permanent immigration combined (CIC, 2010, pp. 6, 66; CIC, 2012, pp. 6, 66). While the Canadian state cannot straightforwardly induce more people to migrate temporarily for work, it can shape differential access to its national labour market for different types of workers, from different sending countries, and it can make certain types of immigration streams or work permits easier or harder to access. Underscoring Canada’s role as a host state is not to deny that migrants exercise agency in deciding whether or not to migrate for employment and that their families and other networks socially reproduce the conditions to make that possible (Sassen, 1988). But, as Michael Buroway suggests, “the volume of migrant labour is not something to be taken as given but is created and recreated by the state” (1976, p. 1076). The reproduction or shaping of Canada’s current volumes of migrant workers reflects a general de-emphasis of the national scale in favour of others.

DE-EMPHASIZING THE NATIONAL SCALE

Canadian immigration categories and controls have previously been largely associated with the national scale, but now the activities of the federal government support new actors and imperatives. This orientation of state activity toward scales other than national has been characterized as “denationalization” (Sassen, 2006). It is visible, on the one hand, through categories of temporary entry increasingly developed by actors, and at venues, associated with trade agreements and negotiations—notably NAFTA and GATS/WTO (Pellerin, 2008). On the other hand, decision-making powers over temporary entry and permanent residency have been downloaded increasingly to provinces and individual employers. The number of temporary work permits issued according to federal–provincial agreements began with around 1,600 permits in 2009 and surpassed 10,000 permits just two years later in 2011 (IRCC, 2016). One significant factor in this increase has been provincial nominee programs, through which employers “pre-select” workers for the programs, thereby giving private actors the capacity to decide on this important pathway to permanency. This is part of a set of policy changes in recent decades that has been characterized as “employer-driven immigration” (Valiani, 2013). Moreover, the Canadian immigration system has consistently prioritized more contemporary categories of global mobility (represented by the IMP), which grant transnational employers and associations a more prominent role in selection, and de-emphasized the more traditional categories (represented by the TFWP) by making the requirements more onerous.

REFERENCES


Temporary foreign worker status, page 32
“PERMANENT TEMPORARINESS”

For migrants in Canada today, citizenship has become a question mark rather than a definitive status. Over the last decade, a majority of migration to Canada has been funnelled into a complex array of precarious legal categories and temporary work programs, creating a system of “permanent temporariness” for many (Goldring & Landolt, 2013). The flip side of this process is that permanent residency is becoming increasingly out of reach for all but the rich and those whose labour is arbitrarily deemed “high-skilled.” This institutionalization of temporary and precarious migration is observable in a majority of Western countries today and contributes to what De Genova (2002) calls the “production of migrant illegality” by nation-states.

This effectively means that, despite Canada’s celebrated image of multiculturalism and humanitarianism, its increasingly restrictive immigration regime has been instrumental in the production of an estimated 500,000 residents who lack or have been denied legal immigration status (Solidarity City Network, 2013; Faraday, 2012). In addition to this population, many more people continue to navigate their way between various precarious statuses, often moving in and out of legality in the process (Goldring, Berinstein, & Bernhard, 2009). Though largely obscured by the long shadow cast by the United States, a growing number of non-status migrants in Canada face similar exclusions from social, political, and economic life and live in daily fear of being discovered, detained, and eventually deported.

The production of migrant illegality in Canada has been paired with new modes of immigration enforcement.

Since the creation of the Canada Border Services Agency (CBSA) in 2003, there has been a significant shift toward more domestically focused and networked enforcement strategies (Pratt, 2005). Mirroring a broader trend in the policing of migration internationally, this shift in enforcement strategy effectively “detaches” the border (and its policing) from its traditional locations at or near national boundaries and multiplies its presence throughout the national space (Sassen, 2006). Immigration enforcement is better understood today as a complex latticework of spaces, times, and interactions at and within the boundaries of the nation that regulate the “differential inclusion” (Mezzadra & Neilson, 2013) or expulsion (Walters, 2002) of precarious and non-status migrants. An important process that has facilitated this shift has been the integration and networking of federal enforcement activities with local-level actors and institutions. In Canada, this process has emerged largely informally, in contrast to examples in the United States and the European Union (Provine et al., 2016; Bigo, 2006).

FEDERAL–LOCAL BORDER ENFORCEMENT

Informal federal–local networks have expanded to include city services, hospitals, schools, public transit enforcement, local businesses, private security, and even civil society itself via CBSA “snitch lines” (Villegas, 2015; Walsh, 2014; Bhuyan, 2012; Varsanyi, 2008). Most concerning, however, are the new relationships emerging between the CBSA and local police forces. Despite the “public safety” mandate of police forces, they do not protect or serve precarious and non-status migrants across Canada; instead, they have the discretionary power to enforce immigration warrants, leading them to actively collaborate with provincial and federal agencies to coordinate immigration raids and routinely perform thousands of arbitrary immigration “status checks,” primarily on racialized populations, as a strategy of “weeding out” non-status migrants living in Canada (Moffette & Gardner, 2015). At its core, the collaboration between the CBSA and local police is increasingly entangled with questions of citizenship and belonging under neoliberalism, which drives the literal and symbolic policing of precarious and non-status migrants’ presence in the national space.

Amid this expansion of federal immigration enforcement to the local level, in 2013 the city of Toronto became Canada’s first sanctuary city. Specifically, this meant that city services were to operate on a “don’t ask, don’t tell” mandate regarding immigration status. In other words, this meant ensuring that immigration status was not a prerequisite to safely access city services, and if someone’s lack of status was discovered, such information was not to be shared with the CBSA or any other agency. While this was a landmark policy that promised greater access to city services for an estimated 200,000 non-status migrants living in the Greater Toronto Area (Keung, 2013), implementation has remained slow and the policy has proven to be largely symbolic (Gardner, 2017). Despite critiques from social movements and agencies concerning the symbolism of sanctuary declarations,
city councils in Hamilton, Vancouver, and Montreal have all made similar declarations.

SANCTUARY CITIES
It is therefore important to qualify the reach of sanctuary policies. If limited simply to a municipal policy shift, “sanctuary” will not become a reality for precarious and non-status migrants. In Ontario, many essential services are provincially regulated: education, health care, social assistance, and local police forces are all effectively untouched by sanctuary city policies. This unique constitutional and jurisdictional context in Canadian cities differentiates their sanctuary city efforts from those in the United States. Canadian sanctuary cities are not powerless, however. Sanctuary cities may begin as formal policy shifts, but they also represent an important scaffolding to begin creating a culture shift in these cities. Beyond attempting to offer limited, tangible support to non-status migrants, sanctuary city policies can be understood as articulating a vision of grassroots (Basok, 2006) or urban (Isin, 2002) citizenship rooted in presence rather than papers (Varsanyi, 2006). By providing improved access to some of the entitlements and spaces traditionally reserved for citizens, sanctuary cities represent a small step toward creating new forms of belonging that exist within and against state-defined categories of migrant il/legality.

It is precisely at this fever pitch of sanctuary that we must begin having honest conversations about the potentials and limits of sanctuary cities. The tension I’ve laid out in the context of Toronto is one aspect of this conversation. On the one hand, there is a concerted move to devolve immigration enforcement to the local level via a variety of actors, the most concerning of which is local police forces. On the other hand, Toronto passed a sanctuary city policy requiring all city services to decouple service provision from legal immigration status and to refrain from cooperating in immigration enforcement. Toronto is therefore just one example of emerging multi-scalar tensions among citizenship, jurisdiction, policing, and national security that are becoming commonplace in cities across the United States and Canada.
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Travelling with Father Morin: Missionaries, colonial projects, and the transnational core of national debates in Quebec

For those struggling against mounting racism in Quebec, the January 2017 white nationalist massacre of six Muslim mosque-goers seemed almost inevitable. In a society with entrenched historical patterns of anxiety over questions of religion, language, and identity, the debate about “reasonable accommodation” of minorities dominates the national conversation. At the crux of the issue lies Quebecers’ deeply held belief in a modern origin myth that explains how the province cast off a backward, Catholic past to emerge into a contemporary era of secularism, human rights, and equality.

HISTOIRES CONNECTÉES
In intellectual tension with the contemporary moment, historians of Quebec are increasingly moving from an emphasis on national narratives to the histoires connectées of communities and social groups in the province across borders and oceans. Others have given thought to how trends within the Catholic Church, rather than presenting obstacles to progress, have been central to the post-WWII transformation of Quebec society—the “Quiet Revolution.” Within these historiographies, particular emphasis is placed on the foundational role of Quebec Catholic missionaries in creating and disseminating knowledge about the colonial Other for domestic consumption. Around 1900, the Catholic Church in Quebec began to send out young men and women to convert non-Christians around the globe. “Missionary publications, along with returned missionaries,” writes historian Sean Mills, “brought understandings of the non-Western world back home to Quebec, shaping attitudes and forging cultural perceptions.”

One of the earliest involvements of Quebec Catholics in foreign missionary endeavours came through a French group, the White Fathers of Africa. The history of the group, which was founded in 1868 by Cardinal Charles Allemand Lavigerie, is inseparable from the story of the imperial division of the continent from which they took their name. Lavigerie saw Africa as a battleground between Christians and Muslims for the souls of the “negro countries,” where, “as a result of the rapid advances made by war-like Arab tribes,” Islam was “making vast strides ... at the very door of our colonies.”

By 1906 Morin was in French West Africa, continuing his Orientalist task of cataloguing the various peoples he met for a Catholic audience back home. Writing from Dakar, he drew a picture for the thousands of readers of Missions d’Afrique of “n———s dressed in the strangest costumes, ranging from sheer nakedness to loincloths to three-piece suits that would be coveted on the streets of Paris.” Later that year, as the British Empire cemented control over the Gold Coast (present-day Ghana), the bilingual Father Morin became Superior of a new mission in the Ghana-
ian region of Navrongo. He attributed this new position of authority to Britain’s stipulation that the head of the mission in an “English country” be a British subject. From its beginnings, the Gold Coast mission was concerned with regulating and disciplining the indigenous Gurunsi population. Morin wrote home to his Quebec audience in October 1906 that his main task was teaching English and touring the country to “tame the souls of our savages.”

During the First World War, when many West Africans were forced into the French military and much of the region was in revolt against its occupiers, Morin was called back to lead the mission in French territory (in Ouagadougou, present-day Burkina Faso). Despite financial difficulties presented by the war, French-Canadian White Fathers in Soudan français continued to be primarily concerned with the battle with Islam over pagan souls, reporting that “Islamism is amongst the obstacles that have prevented Grace from opening up a path, despite the zealous perseverance of our missionaries.” Following the war, Morin found himself once again in Navrongo, rising to the position of Vicar Apostolic for the region in 1933.

Upon his retirement in 1947, Morin finally returned to Montreal. Long having shaped the imaginations of his audiences through his letters and reports, he now worked from the White Fathers headquarters on St-Hubert Street, established in 1934. The group visited parishes, schools, and colleges across Quebec, organized touring exhibits that reached cities across Canada and the United States, and produced educational films about the group’s mission work. “You should all become missionaries!” they encouraged their readers in 1929, a message that was reinforced through their participation in mass public missionary “fairs.” Their advertisement for one such event in 1930 speaks to the depth of the entrenchment of missionary work in Quebec society, through ties of parish, family, and friendship: “What good heart can ignore the labour of its brothers, sisters, parents and friends, of its compatriots? Well, missionaries are your brothers, your sisters, your parents, your friends, your compatriots.” Morin, whose reprinted letters home to his family were for four decades an important source of information for Quebeckers about African societies, Islam, and non-white cultures, was no exception.

QUESTIONING THE ORIGIN MYTH

There is a larger story to be told here about Quebec’s missionary spirit and its evolution in the second half of the 20th century, and more particularly about its continued ideological impact in a “secularized” society struggling with racism and patterns of exclusion. Foregrounding the thought and work of missionaries like Father Oscar Morin can begin to tell us something about the historical identification of Quebeckers with global processes of imperialism, and particularly about the entanglement of Quebec identity with Orientalist discourses about Muslim backwardness. In so doing, we can begin to explore the transnational and contingent roots of what too often seems to be a fixed Québécois cultural mode, and to take the first steps forward in building a new, just, model of Quebec society.

NOTES


WHERE DO WE GO AFTER RESISTANCE?

This question has been probed numerous times academically, socially, and politically, but less often emotionally. In response to the current state of affairs in the United States, I recently attended a number of protests, just as my parents did several years ago, during the height of tension between the US and Iraq. While protests are continuously organized and attended, especially in light of the proliferation of rising conservatism and oppressive regimes, the general consensus is that they do not work effectively in swaying governments or inciting political change. Micah White, one of the founders of the Occupy movement, writes in The End of Protest: A New Playbook for Revolution that the traditional protest model is anachronistic and ineffective, now functioning largely as a form of expression or a display of solidarity (White, 2016, p. 89). But it was the direct generational link between my parents, protesting outside the US Embassy, and me, now doing the same, that prompted me to think more deeply about what I am perpetuating or reproducing by taking part in this kind of resistance.

In my artistic practice, I have worked extensively with found family photos and media images of the Iraq war to explore tensions between conflicting representations of the people and landscapes in these images. One of my aims has been to resist and reshape the dominant narrative surrounding this identity. In The Better Story: Queer Affects from the Middle East, Dina Georgis argues that “by expressing postcolonial injuries exclusively through the terms of resistance and agency, we limit ourselves and the potential for political change” (2013, p. 98). She later states that “postcolonial studies have not helped us think through the emotional fixities of identities” (p. 103), and I agree with this. Through a deeper consideration of post-colonial concepts of identity, I concluded that working with images kept me locked in a frozen state and did not produce results that I could find beneficial to the history being explored at large. Instead of engaging with a practice steeped in representation, I shifted my focus onto something that necessitated more time from the audience and could yield a deeper sense of understanding beyond this fixity in identity.

As Susan Sontag wrote in Regarding the Pain of Others, “Narratives can make us understand. Photographs do something else: they haunt us” (2004, p. 71).

PRESERVING THE PAST

The shift began with a personal anecdote from my grandmother that had fascinated me for quite some time. On her last day in Iraq in 1977, she ate two fresh apricots and unconsciously threw the seeds in her suitcase before leaving. They travelled with her to England, where she stayed for two years before finally settling in Canada. She found the seeds again and began to sprout them in a couple of pots, only to find little green bursts of life emerging from the soil months later. Today, plotted in the front yard of my family’s home are two large apricot trees, grown serendipitously by my grandmother 37 years ago. They bear hundreds of fruits almost every summer.

Aside from apricots, there were four...
other fruits that my family incessantly gathered and feasted upon throughout my childhood, and these were figs, sweet limes, fresh dates, and pomegranates.

During the winter I began to collect, deseed, and catalogue the remains of pomegranates, without thinking too deeply about why I was doing this.

It wasn’t until I performed the deseeding that I realized I was enacting what I had tacitly learned at an affective, pre-conscious level.

Here I was, reproducing an act that is central to the identity of many who live in the diaspora: to preserve and uphold a precious remnant from the past.

But in consciously examining this, I made other discoveries, and the repetition of this act unravelled many of the expectations that surrounded it. There is a great deal of inconsistency in the aesthetics of the pomegranate. Formally, the size, shape, and colour can vary a fair bit, but the taste—which one would assume is most central to the fruit as an edible object—varies even more than any other aspect of the pomegranate. In fact, the only true consistency I found was in the way the object sounds when the skin is scored and peeled back, the seeds are cracked off the flesh, and their resonation as they fall into the bowl.

An interesting parallel can be found in the way that these fruits—colloquially deemed “exotic”—are also in a state of diaspora as a result of their migration through imports and exports. But while it is meant to serve as a reminder of a family history situated in Iraq, the fruits we consume in Canada today do not share the same country of origin. Pomegranates, for example, are often imported from Israel and Peru.

As a result, the connections that are expected to exist in these fruit are not there, and the associations that are discovered are, in turn, unexpected. When so many links to those memories—and thus, the way they function as a binder in diasporic identity—fall apart, what remains?

**CATALYSTS FOR BECOMING**

It is at this point, after conscious consideration, when a process of mourning can be pursued and followed by an openness to change. In *Precarious Life*, while speaking of mourning in a post-9/11 context, Judith Butler considers that “one mourns when one accepts that by the loss one undergoes one will be changed, possibly for ever. Perhaps mourning has to do with agreeing to undergo a transformation” (2004, p. 21). Instead of preserving the past, I now ask: what are the transformative qualities of this object, and how can it be used as a catalyst for becoming something otherwise?

Through mourning, the post-colonial self can heal, change, and develop. With personal narrative as the foundation for this research, I continue to explore how performance, object manipulation, and growth can create a shift in focus from fixation on the past to a willingness to release transformative potential and bear new fruit in the process.
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Disability policy in Canada and new funding initiatives: Innovative or opportunistic?

ONE-SIZE-FITS-ALL

Since the 1800s, people with intellectual disabilities in Canada have had minimal opportunity to experience true freedom and self-determination in their own lives. This struggle persists as a result of limitations in the equitable assessments used to establish funding for many Canadians with intellectual disabilities. Currently in Canada, most people with intellectual disabilities rely on provincial government funding for all aspects of their lives. Government departments across Canada are increasingly seeking measures to develop and implement standardized funding models. These models are outcome-based and create a one-size-fits-all approach to the funding provided to people with intellectual disabilities. Provincial governments are also moving toward the exclusive use of quantitative methodologies, excluding qualitative measures, to assess and determine funding for adults with intellectual disabilities. This is done to produce outcome-based data, which are viewed as objective and concrete, rather than qualitative data, which are viewed as subjective and non-tangible.

Of note is the Supports Intensity Scale (SIS) assessment tool, which is currently being used in Manitoba and Ontario as the sole tool to assess and measure the level of funding each qualifying adult receives from the province. The SIS quantitatively “measure[s] the level of supports that a person with an intellectual disability needs in order to successfully participate in areas such as home living, community living, lifelong learning, employment, health and safety, and social activities” (Government of Manitoba, 2017).

QUESTIONS ABOUT THE SIS TOOL

There remains much skepticism about whether the SIS is a valid and reliable tool to measure and determine funding levels, which ultimately shape services for people. Much of the criticism is levelled at the administration of the assessment, which produces biased data that often reflect only the opinions of others, not the opinions of those receiving support. Another criticism is that the SIS has been manipulated by government departments for use as a tool for reducing funding, rather than for its intended purpose as an assessment tool to measure a person’s support needs. Currently, SIS assessments to determine funding are being used by provincial governments as a move toward an “increasing emphasis on outcomes and performance assessments” (Jenaro et al., 2013, p. 497). Provincial governments stress that “it is important to examine support needs at the population level, to ensure that public services meet the requirements of clients in the community and to improve resource capacity and allocation” (Weiss et al., 2009, p. 933). Indeed, in recent years, “the SIS has become the measure of choice among state and provincial governments who aim to understand and analyze the service needs of their citizens with intellectual disability” (Weiss et al., 2009, p. 934). The issue with implementing the SIS is that it removes any autonomy, individual rights, and choice that persons should receive in order to exercise their freedom and self-determination. In 2010, Developmental Services Ontario, within the Ministry of Community and Social Services, adopted the use of the SIS as the criterion for receiving services. “The SIS is intended to be used in conjunction with person-centred planning processes to assist planning teams to develop individualized support plans that are responsive to the needs and choices of persons with disabilities” (CSCN, 2010, p. 3). However, the SIS is being used by Manitoba and Ontario as the only tool for determining the support needs of individuals. As a result, the tool becomes invalid because it not being used with person-centred planning, which also includes factors such as quality of life.

MISSING MEASURES: QUALITY OF LIFE

Proponents of the SIS argue for the validity of the SIS as a proven, reliable tool to determine the funding needs for people with intellectual disabilities. They argue that the “SIS has potential, if used insightfully, to document the support required to make a good life a reality for the people we serve” (Swanton et al., 2010, p. 26). Further, “the SIS scores provide valid information regarding the intensity of support needs of individuals with intellectual disability currently receiving services” (Weiss et al., 2009, p. 939). While the SIS does quantitatively measure a person’s functional areas, it excludes any qualitative areas such as quality of life.

The major flaw with this approach is that the administration of the SIS needs to be more holistic. It is important to include “both objective measures (e.g. functional assessment characteristics) and subjective measures (e.g. Life Satisfaction) in order to get a better understanding of the [quality of life] of people with [intellectual disabilities]” (Schwartz & Rabinovitz, 2003, p. 83). The main issue with using the SIS as the sole assessment tool in assessing funding is...
that it leaves out other proven and valid ways of determining the funding needs of people, particularly in the measurement of the quality-of-life indicators. For example, the Personal Outcomes Measures tool could be a good complement to the SIS assessment. It measures 21 indicators that are used to “understand the presence, importance and achievement of outcomes, involving choice, health, safety, social capital, relationships, rights, goals, dreams, [and] employment” (Council on Quality and Leadership, 2017) as determined by the person and his or her support network.

ETHICAL QUESTIONS

There are also ethical questions around the use of SIS as a tool to measure needs and establish funding for a person with an intellectual disability. The criticism is that the tool is considered inhumane, because its implementation subjects people to invasive questions over a period of hours or days. “Many individuals and families have complained about the humiliating experience of being subject to the hours long interrogation of a SIS assessment that has little to offer in advancing their hopes and dreams” (Inclusion Alberta, 2016). In 2016, Alberta repealed its use of the SIS for this reason. The Alberta minister for human services stated that the government is “committed to reviewing the SIS and bringing in a policy that is more respectful in gauging the supports that people with developmental disabilities need” (Inclusion Alberta, 2016). Abilities Manitoba, a coalition of community-based organizations offering services for people with intellectual disabilities in Manitoba, believes that “the system needs a quality assurance framework to ensure value for money. The framework needs to be value-based and person-centered with measurable goals and tools for improvements” (Abilities Manitoba, 2017). This further strengthens the argument that a holistic approach, which includes an individual’s assessment of what quality of life entails for them, needs to be in place. As long as the SIS assessment remains the sole criterion for funding, the quality of services that people receive is at risk.

To date, there is little research into the validity and reliability of the SIS or its implementation in determining funding and ultimately the lives of people with intellectual disabilities. The scholarly literature on the SIS is unbalanced because it only promotes the validity and positive value that the tool brings to the field of intellectual disability. Scholarly literature that scrutinizes and questions the validity and reliability of the SIS as an assessment tool for determining funding and services for people with intellectual disabilities remains non-existent. This provides an exciting opportunity for more research and the development of practical applications in these areas in order to provide a balanced approach to the topic and to offer people with intellectual disabilities a future with greater freedom and self-determination.
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Monstrous bodies, mad minds: Reading trauma through the body in Indigenous and diasporic contexts

**MAD, COLONIZED BODIES**

Within colonial narratives, traumatically violated racial bodies are often subsequently positioned as psychologically damaged, or mad. Representations of madness occasionally work to obscure the reality of colonial complicity in trauma; however, those same mad bodies can force acknowledgment of past wrongdoings and the traumatic after-effects of colonizing efforts. Through a reading of the character Sammy Aandeg in Drew Hayden Taylor’s novel *Motorcycles and Sweetgrass*, and Dionne Brand’s autobiographical collection of essays on displacement, *A Map to the Door of No Return*, I aim to show that “madness” might be read as symptomatic of ongoing colonial oppression. These texts follow, respectively, the traumatic history of residential schools in Canada, and colonizers’ persistent efforts in both the Caribbean and Canada to obscure Black culture, resulting in violent conflict and a legacy of trauma. This article discusses seemingly background inclusions in Taylor’s and Brand’s texts in order to unpack the insidious effects of settler colonialism, reading “mad” colonized bodies as corporeal disruptions of a historical amnesia surrounding ongoing colonial trauma.

My purpose in bringing together works by these Anishnawbe and Caribbean-Canadian authors is to highlight the presence of a shared trauma between Indigenous and diasporic populations, founded upon violent British imperialism and settler colonial expansion. While Indigenous and Black histories, epistemologies, and cosmologies often differ, I believe that certain traumas express themselves in similar fashion. Reading physical and psychological trauma through mad bodies in literature provides particularly fruitful ground for a study in the ongoing effects of violent colonialism. Within a space of literary representation, we might consider how depictions of “monstrous” characters acknowledge trauma while resisting the rigid binary of the “mad/monstrous” racial Other and the sane, “normal” colonizer. This alternative approach instead focuses on the multi-layered responses to trauma and its after-effects.

If we understand madness as a means of political and social articulation, the works of Brand and Taylor appear as more than isolated literary texts. By writing on the “madness” of diasporic unbelonging, Brand explores the psychological aspect of uprootedness, while also referencing moments of direct physical violence. Taylor meanwhile writes the unsettling presence of the character of Sammy Aandeg as a disruptive, loud, inebriated force, yet also a character who continues to hurt deeply from his experiences (of sexual, physical, and psychological abuse) in the residential school system. In both *Map to the Door of No Return* and *Motorcycles and Sweetgrass*, Brand and Taylor narrate “craziness” to confront silenced, unresolved racial traumas.

**PERSISTENT TRAUMAS OF COLONIALISM**

Dionne Brand’s work engages with and challenges a Western “imperialist need for obliterating the past of the colonized” (Ifowodo on Frantz Fanon, 2013, p. ix). In moments of linguistic resistance, Brand writes to question the erasure of trauma from historical narratives, inverting the view that “writing need not show your skin, it need not speak for trouble” (2001, p. 100). In *Map to the Door*, following the aftermath of the 1983 US-led invasion of Grenada and Brand’s witnessing the deaths of many fellow citizens, she pointedly asks Caribbean-Canadian writer and activist Marlene NourbeSe Philip: “did we, did you go crazy after? Did you have trouble with life?” (2001, pp. 156, 169). Brand acknowledges the persistent traumas of colonialism in the very style and substance of her writing, picking at the wounds of a colonial past, “fresher still the older [history] grows” (2001, p. 62). Her question to Marlene begins her attempt to make sense of incomprehensible violence, which often manifests itself in moments of incomprehensibility, of speech, of thought, or of action; in these moments of supposed mental instability, her ethnic body becomes associated with madness. In *No Language Is Neutral*, Brand writes: “When I came/back from Grenada and went crazy for two years, that/time when I could hear anything and my skin was/flaming like a nerve and the walls were like paper/and my eyes could not close” (1998, p. 239). Through her writing she reflects on the all-encompassing, often viscerally corporeal, aspects of “madness” resulting from having experienced severe trauma.

By positioning the “horrendous, violent, abrupt, ruptural breaks” of colonial history at the forefront of her writing, Brand engages with identity formation and displacement and belonging in the Caribbean, considering Stuart Hall’s...
assertion that “what we now call the Caribbean was reborn in and through violence” (2005, p. 547). This violence and rupture arguably contributes to feelings of unsettlement, which psychologically become difficult to bear—hence, Brand’s question to Marlene. Furthermore, the “mixture of the melancholy, fear, and anxiety that stems from cultural dislocation” is apparent in much of Brand’s work, which articulates “both the physical and emotional state of displacement,” and reflects the broader scope of physical and emotional convergence that this article explores through the lens of madness (Brand, 2001, p. 93; Haynes, 2013, p. 52).

HISTORICAL PAIN—RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL LEGACIES

Building upon Brand’s moments of reminiscing and literary resistance, I turn now to Taylor’s explorations in Motorcycles and Sweetgrass of “how to live without historical pain” (Brand, 2001, p. 157). While Taylor’s novel centres on the Ojibwa itinerant trickster (or Nana-bush) figure John and his relationship with Otter Lake Chief Maggie and her sulking teenage son, Virgil, this article focuses on the community’s resident drunk, Sammy Aandeg. Despite being a minor supporting character, Sammy provides rich material for my analysis of colonial trauma. His appearance is a reminder of the colonial legacy of the residential school system in Canada, as he copes with the trauma of his experience through what appears to be madness: “Everybody just thinks he’s crazy old Sammy Aandeg, but there’s method to his madness” (Taylor, 2011, p. 172).

Indeed, Sammy’s behaviour aligns with what might be expected of someone suffering from PTSD, as, despite efforts to dull a traumatic past through alcohol, certain memories persist. He copes in select, although unconventional, moments when the “method to his madness” shines through. For example, I am interested specifically in his obsession with speaking in iambic pentameter, an apparent lingering effect of his British education and of having been forced to read Hamlet while locked in a shed as punishment for speaking Anishnawbe. Into adulthood, Sammy retains ties to “the forbidden language” (2011, p. 14) of Anishnawbe, speaking an odd mix of his Indigenous tongue and Shakespearean English, which erects barriers to understanding between him and the community, and reinforces the common perception of him as crazy. Thus, Sammy’s ability to communicate the horrors of his experience at the residential school is severely limited, and he communicates the only way he knows how—by attempting to reconnect with his Indigenous roots through his own pidgin version of English and Anishnawbe.

Sammy experienced physical and psychological abuse along with long-term trauma as a result of isolation, loneliness, and an unbridgeable distance from a support system of friends and family during his time in the residential school system. In the pursuit of “the intellectual emancipation of the Indian,” various abuses including “institutionalized pedophilia” were kept quiet so as to further the larger goal of “civilizing” the native peoples (Episkenew, 2009, p. 45; Grant, 1996, p. 229). Any rebelliousness or questioning of the residential school system was forcibly dissuaded, as “one did not wade against the current of the Angry Place” (Taylor, 2011, p. 11). While this abuse is only alluded to in Taylor’s novel, its psychological effects are apparent in Sammy’s demeanour. Besides communicating in his unique creolized language, Sammy also turns to alcohol to dull the pain from his traumatic experiences. Ultimately, “no amount of bottles and their contents could drive away the demons; it could merely mute them for short periods of time” (Taylor, 2011, p. 254). While the traumas of colonial power still haunt Sammy’s everyday life, he continuously enacts small instances of rebellion, as he perverts the revered Shakespearean iambic pentameter as revenge against Father McKenzie and embraces the bottle.

WRITING THE CRAZY

Brand’s and Taylor’s works force readers to confront the emotional implications of trauma, including the psychological damage that leads some individuals to be driven “crazy.” Thus, writing becomes a political act as stories imbricate madness in their telling, subverting expectations and problematizing the binary between madness and normality. In both Brand’s and Taylor’s texts, “madness” arises from unbelonging and an inability to cope with that alienation. Yet, madness ultimately does not allow for the disappearance or rewriting of trauma. Brand and Taylor succeed, at least in part, in denying the repression of madness and allowing it to “[make] itself heard,” demonstrating how colonial madness “has survived as a speaking subject only in and through literary texts” (Felman, 2003, p. 15). I am cautiously hopeful that through exposure to writing that does not deny a horrific history of colonialism, I might agree with
Direct audience address in Cliff Cardinal’s Huff: Complicity, powerlessness, and sovereignty

THE COLONIAL GAZE

Direct audience address, widely known as “breaking the fourth wall,” is a mode of theatrical communication in which the performer addresses the spectator directly. This article lays out the mechanics of the direct address, and examines how Cliff Cardinal, in his play Huff, employs this convention to question/challenge the politics of the colonial gaze. The performative action of direct address seeks to overthrow and/or refigure the colonial relationship, which haunts relations between white settlers, non-white immigrants and refugees, and Indigenous peoples. This address is achieved within the performance encounter itself as well as through the infrastructural conditions of the performance, including its appeal to specific audiences.

Both dramatically and in a broader theatrical context, direct address is flexible and can serve a multitude of purposes. One purpose is to establish or attempt to create specific kinds of performer–audience relationships through what theatre phenomenologist Bert O. States calls the “collaborative” mode of performance (1985, p. 170). Hans-Thies Lehmann points to the device’s immediacy when he observes that it “reinforces the certainty of our perception of the dramatic events as a reality in the now, authenticated through the implication of the audience” (2006, p. 127). Lehmann also hints at subversive possibilities through “transgression of the border of the imaginary dramatic universe to the real theatrical situation,” a liminal space that may emerge through the device (p. 128). This recalls Australian theatre scholar Joanne Tompkins’s “heterotopia.” Tompkins, after Foucault and others, defines heterotopias as “imagined spaces in dialogue with real ones,” which reside in “the interstices between the performance and the real of today” (2012, p. 106). In this interstitial gap, Tompkins argues, is the “potential for (re)thinking theatre’s function in its social space” through “heterotopic dialogue” between the world of the actor and that of the audience (p. 106). Direct address in the plays I study facilitates this type of dialogue, tying the fictional world of the play and the audience’s “real” world through a foregrounding of the simultaneity of time, place, and space; the fostering of particular relationships between performer and audience; and the implication, or “participation,” of the audience in the performance.

THE POWER OF DIRECT ADDRESS

Michelle Olson discusses the power of the audience gaze in Indigenous dance performance. She says of the proscenium, the frame through which the fourth wall is created and maintained, “the rules of power are deeply embedded in its structure and informed by the historical context it was birthed from” (2016, p. 273). In a proscenium setup, Olson argues, “the audience sits in opposition to the performer, in a place of power and a place of judgment” (p. 273). She suggests that “out of this complete inequity in this audience/performer relationship...a gaze arises. The gaze of the oppressor. The gaze of one in power” (p. 274). For Olson, this gaze is, importantly, both institutional and individual: the gaze of the theatre and that of the non-Indigenous spectator. Olson’s response to its power is to find ways of “destabilizing the gaze” (p. 279), something that the playwrights and performers I study attempt to do through direct address. For example, in Huff, Cree/Lakota playwright Cliff Cardinal uses direct address to assert sovereignty, to challenge audience complicity in colonial violence, and to confront the erasure of Indigenous bodies through colonial occupation.

Huff is a brutal and powerful play that presents the effects of colonialism and the residential school system on a family, especially two young brothers, Wind and Huff. The play deals with what Cardinal calls “our most taboo subculture”: “First Nations’ kids abusing solvents, at high risk of suicide” (2017, p. iv), and Cardinal plays all of its 20 or so characters, including the narrator, Wind. The play is well aware of the power of the gaze as a violent act. At the reservation school, a disobedient pupil is greeted by the class with a “Care Bear Stare” (p. 39), a supposedly compassionate act that instead causes the boy to defecate. Huff also gives form to Olson’s assertion that “the colonial gaze upon the Indigenous body has been our inherited collective self-perception” (p. 278). When a high Wind fantasizes himself as the star of Hockey Night in Canada, the announcer reports, “What a performance, Harry! And he’s only an Indian!” (p. 15).

This awareness of the gaze’s power sets the scene for Cardinal’s return of the audience’s gaze. From the performer’s opening address—“turn off your fucking cellphone”—it is clear that in this show the audience will not be granted...
the pleasure of passive observation (p. 5). Cardinal confronts the audience at various points by swearing, unzipping his fly, and graphically simulating rape. At the same time, he also creates complicit, often convivial connections with the audience, such as asking an audience member to free him from a suffocating plastic bag over his head. After he is freed, he asks the spectator to keep the bag from him, no matter what, establishing audience complicity in the play’s outcome.

**Challenging Complacency and Complicity**

Importantly, Cardinal, as the storyteller, not only has the power to invoke close relations with the audience, but also to dismiss us. We are addressed as “imaginary friends”—an assertion that emerges from Wind’s hypoxic brain (p. 6), but also resonates with the Canadian government’s absence and silence during Indigenous crises. Cardinal’s dismissal subverts the powerful narratives by which Indigenous groups “have been largely rendered nameless in [Canada’s] master-narrative … unimagined and legislated into silence by the settler-state” (Carter, 2015, p. 420) by allowing Cardinal to render us nameless (“they’re not even real,” Wind tells his brother (Cardinal, 2017, p. 50)). At the play’s end, after the accidental suicide of his brother, Wind pleads for the plastic bag to be returned to him. The spectator’s refusal, however, is ultimately frustrated as he pulls out yet another plastic bag and places it on his head. Wind ultimately survives, deciding to free himself through the aid of the spirit of his younger brother, in what Carter calls an “utterly sovereign act” (2015, p. 428), eschewing a narrative of victimhood (despite the disturbing content of the play) and denying the audience both the position of saviour and the notion that broken Indigenous-settler relations can be fixed by one reparative act.

Direct address is a device that allows marginalized groups to speak back to the colonial gaze of the theatre institution. In Huff, this device uses theatrical conventions against the audience as it urgently asks them to challenge their own complacency and complicity within the settler-colonial state. My larger research builds on this work to investigate how direct audience address in contemporary performance can help audience members and performers to negotiate the complexities of inhabiting a 21st-century globalized Canada.

**References**


Unsettled ground: The ruins of closed residential schools and Canadian identity

The physical spaces of closed and now deteriorating Indigenous residential schools in Canada carry enormous discursive and cultural weight. Decades after their closure, the ruins of residential schools are physical reminders of the colonial violence committed through the residential schools program. My research examines the meaning-making role of residential schools within the post–Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) era of Indigenous–state negotiations.

CLOSED YET POWERFUL
Canada’s state-sanctioned residential schools (frequently run by religious groups) upheld inherently racist colonial objectives and attitudes that resulted in systematic genocidal violence (Anderson, 2012; Carter, 2003; Kelm, 1996; Milloy, 1999; Haig-Brown, 1988; de Leeuw, 2009; Alfred, 2010). Within residential schools, all expressions of Indigenous cultural identity were fiercely punished (Alfred, 2010; Furniss, 1992; de Leeuw, 2009; Regan, 2010; Chrisjohn & Young, 1997). Founded on colonialism, expanded through violence, and defined by the relentless evictions of Indigenous peoples from their land, Canada’s national history is one of genocidal and cultural violence against Indigenous peoples (Chrisjohn & Young, 1997; Miller, 2000). Residential schools are essential sites of these processes. Although they are no longer in operation, the physical presence of these structures allows the attitudes, norms, and violence of these spaces to continue. My research is premised on a recognition that although the residential schools are closed (the last one in 1996), the schools, even as deteriorating structures, hold significant power.

Sunera Thobani’s conceptualization of “exalted subjects” meshes well with the meaning-making functionality of residential schools. National subjects are produced through a ritualized and ongoing project that she refers to as “exaltation” (Thobani, 2007). By being defined as Others, or non-exalted, Indigenous people are written out of the national narrative. They are not only excluded, they are actually constructed as antithetical to the norms, values, and identity of the Canadian national subjects (Thobani, 2007). This exaltation process allowed for, and even necessitated, the establishment of residential schools. The residential schools created exclusive spaces where exalted subjects were able to self-define their role through paternalism as a protector/discipliner in relation to the helpless Indigenous other.

Canadian exalted subjects are characterized as “responsible citizens, compassionate, caring and committed to the values of diversity and multiculturalism” (Thobani, 2007, p. 4). This national identity—characterized as kind and tolerant—ironically fuelled the “child-saving” practices of seizing Indigenous children and forcing their attendance at residential schools (Thobani, 2007, p. 109). In what Thobani describes as the “ethic of compassion,” Indigenous families had their children forcibly removed, and in many cases the intergenerational damage of this collapse of family units is still being experienced (Thobani, 2007, p. 109).

ELIMINATION—ASSIMILATION—RECONCILIATION
Closure didn’t extinguish the social meanings and consequences of residential schools. They continue to have deep implications for Canadian identity constructions and how Canada continues to engage with and govern over Indigenous peoples through a variety of state interventions. The underpinnings of the residential schools that are rooted in a colonial desire to eliminate indigeneity through assimilation to serve the colonial-capitalist labour and commodity needs of the home state continue to affect the policies, programs, and mandates of the government of Canada of the present day.

The idea of reconciliation has become the dominant method and narrative for Indigenous–state relations (Coulthard, 2007). Echoing Dene researcher and activist Glen Coulthard, I reject the apparent neutrality and innocence of the language of reconciliation, and the taken-for-granted nature of “reconciliation” as a strategy (Coulthard, 2007; also Alfred, 2010). My work will encounter the narrative of “reconciliation” at various points, but will approach reconciliation as one among many politicized and value-laden concepts invoked...
by the state in approaching Indigenous-state relations in the contemporary Canadian context. The idea of reconciliation—an idea adopted vigorously by the federal government—is informed by a desire to resolve “Indigenous issues” and to prevent continued threats such as wide-scale Indigenous protests, land claims, and litigation (Alfred, 2010, p. xi). Kanien’kehaka Mohawk academic and activist Taiaiake Alfred questions the language of reconciliation and asks, “[w]hat is the notion of reconciliation doing for Canadian society and what is it doing for Native people?” (Alfred, 2010, p. xi). Indigenous residential schools, as material evidence of the state’s complicity in genocidal violence and destructive assimilation-based policies, conflict with this discourse of reconciliation. Alfred argues that reconciliation obscures how colonial inequalities, racism, and the marginalization of Indigenous people are contemporary issues, not historic ones (Alfred, 2010, p. xi). He finds that reconciliation assumes a completion or a clear finish to these major problems and therefore conceals how they persist (Alfred, 2010, p. xi).

PHYSICAL COMPLICATIONS

The federal government of Canada established the TRC with a mandate to investigate and listen to the experiences of survivors of the Indigenous residential schools program (Regan, 2010). The commission, following multiple sessions across the country and a lengthy fact-gathering process, produced both an interim and a final report, outlining findings and making possible suggestions for next steps in the reconciliation process (TRC, 2015; Regan, 2010). However, within this format and organization of “reconciliation,” there is a prioritization of the individual experiences of survivors, and less attention is focused on the structures and spaces of the schools themselves.

Even as state reconciliatory actions attempt to bracket the colonial past and shape a new way forward, the materiality of residential schools maintains meaning-making power within contemporary society. What emerges from this work is a complicated question: What does it mean that the buildings of residential schools (as sites of genocidal violence) remain across the Canadian landscape? As possibly fitting the category of “ruins of modernity,” their physical presence contests and complicates the contemporary politics of reconciliation by demonstrating the intensity of colonial violence that cannot be contained by any closed history chapter. In the current post-TRC era, the questions of what these sites mean socially and how they might be politically managed are pressing, particularly with regard to contemporary Indigenous-state relations.
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Adam Capay: Injustice toward First Nations offenders in Canadian corrections

In October 2016, Ontario’s chief human rights commissioner, Renu Mandhane, visited the Thunder Bay Provincial Jail. As part of a routine check of the institution, she asked a guard if there was anything else that should be brought to her attention. The guard told her about an inmate who had been in continuous segregation for the last four years. Mandhane was taken to the basement of the facility, where there was 24-hour artificial light and a large Plexiglas cell at the end of the hall. Here Mandhane met Adam Capay. During their interaction, Capay told her he could not tell whether it was night or day. She noticed he was experiencing speech problems and a disorder in memory orientation. She also found him to have self-harm scars. This was when the Ontario Human Rights Commission intervened. The investigation into Capay’s conditions was reported on extensively by Canadian news outlets and came to the attention of members of Parliament. Capay’s situation rose to national prominence for exemplifying deep systemic racism toward Indigenous corrections system, and a deeply embedded systemic racism toward Indigenous inmates (Ballingall & Robinson, 2016; Andrew-Gee & Blaze Baum, 2016).

YEARS IN SEGREGATION

Only 19 years old in 2009, Capay was arrested on minor theft charges and was sent to the Thunder Bay Correctional Centre. While incarcerated, he got into an altercation with another inmate, Sherman Quisses. Capay stabbed Quisses, resulting in the latter’s death. Following the event, Capay was moved from the Correctional Centre to the Thunder Bay District Jail, where he was placed in administrative segregation while awaiting trial. Between the ages of 19 and 22 (Capay is 23 now), Capay resided in segregation with no trial date for his first-degree murder charge in sight. The high rate of incarceration of Indigenous people has been historically linked to discriminatory attitudes based on racial and cultural prejudice, as well as economic and social disadvantage, substance abuse, violence, and trauma (Ballingall & Robinson, 2016).

DETRENTAL SIDE EFFECTS

The controversial debate over solitary confinement surrounds the Capay case. Upon transfer to the Thunder Bay District Jail, Capay was immediately placed in segregation. There is no paper trail to indicate exactly why he was placed in solitary. Typically, solitary is a method of last resort. However, Michael Lundy, a correctional officer at the jail, noted, “[W]e have a couple of inmates that when they come in, we know that we have to clear out segregation space for them because we know we can’t house them anywhere else” (Porter, 2016). Solitary confinement, or administrative segregation, as it is called in Canada, is a form of imprisonment that includes extreme isolation for up to 23 hours per day.

Solitary confinement is accompanied by detrimental physiological and psychological side effects. Sensory deprivation caused by constant light can lead to impairments in speech and memory, as well as impaired vision from depth-perception damage, and is an acknowledged torture technique. Suicidal inmates typically experience an amplification of self-destructive tendencies while in solitary. From 2012 to 2017, Capay was held in segregation for an estimated 1,500 days. The United Nations deems solitary confinement beyond a period of 15 days to be a form of torture (Ballingall & Robinson, 2016).

Solitary confinement may be used for a number of reasons. While awaiting trial, some inmates spend extended periods in segregation for their own or others’ safety or for the notorious nature of their crimes. Indeed, it can take years for some serious offenders to get to trial. Segregation is also used for disciplinary or administrative reasons, such as management of high-profile offenders and punishment for fights, possession of contraband items, and other infractions. Solitary may also be used as an alternative to placing an inmate in the mainstream population or for reasons of mental health, which is another major issue in its own right in corrections.

VIOLATING CHARTER RIGHTS

The Canadian corrections system falls foul in the character of law compared with the United Kingdom and even the United States. For instance, US law has a presumptive period that identifies the acceptable delay from charge to trial in order to avoid an indefinite period of incarceration without a trial date. Like many other individuals in federal prisons, provincial prisons, and even immigration detention centres, Capay has fallen victim to Canada’s non-presumptive period in which detainees can be held for an indefinite period of time (Prokopchuk, 2017). The Supreme Court of Canada has ruled that a delay longer than 30 months constitutes a violation of the Canadian Charter of Rights and
In March 2017, Capay was moved to a new cell, though he continues to be held in solitary confinement. Correctional Services Minister David Orazietti said that Capay is content with the new arrangement. “This individual has been moved from their cell,” he said during Question Period in October 2017. “They are no longer in that same cell. They are in a different location, with appropriate lighting and access to day rooms, spending time out of their cell for showers, phone calls and access to TV. It is my understanding, from speaking to officials, that the inmate is satisfied with the conditions they are presently in.” It should be noted Orazietti says Capay was not moved out of his cell as a result of public pressure but instead for reasons of facility renovations (White & Morrow, 2017).

The inhumane detainment of Capay, while not only a moral issue, also violates sections of the Charter. Among other things, the Charter guarantees to all Canadians the right to be tried within a reasonable amount of time. As mentioned, the Supreme Court considers a delay of more than 30 months to be unreasonable; Capay has waited nearly twice as long. The legal rights of individuals within the justice and law enforcement systems are protected under sections 7 to 14. In Adam Capay’s case, his lawyers argue that his rights and freedoms under sections 7, 9, 12, and 15 have been violated. Section 7 guarantees the right to life, liberty, and security of the person. Section 9 ensures freedom from arbitrary detention or imprisonment. Section 12 deals with the right not to be subjected to cruel and unusual treatment or punishment. Section 15 guarantees the right to be equal before the law and the right to equal protection and benefit of the law without discrimination on the basis of race and/or mental disability (Prokopchuk, 2017). Before Commissioner Mandhane discovered the circumstances of Capay’s confinement in 2016, Capay had been given no access to an Indigenous elder, no opportunity to practise Indigenous spirituality, and limited access to Indigenous-specific programs and supports (Ballingall & Robinson, 2016).

These human rights violations speak volumes about the cruel and inhumane punishment Capay was enduring. It is very easy to think of prison as a different world, a world we never want to see the inside of. If not for Renu Mandhane and prison guards who have made Capay’s struggles visible to us and brought similar circumstances to light, we would continue with our lives in blissful ignorance of the travesties that are taking place on Canadian soil.
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Public celebrations for Canada’s 150th birthday on Coast Salish territory promoted settler cultural denial, distorted history, and maintained the fog of colonialism. Coast Salish peoples have occupied their unceded lands and waters since time immemorial, yet colonial governments marked centennial and sesquicentennial dates of incorporation with elaborate hoaxes of pagentry, often including the Coast Salish themselves, as a means of normalizing settler and Crown occupation of lands and resources. These celebrations emphasized the recent Canadian settler tradition of multiculturalism and relied on the public’s collusion as participants to entrench cultural entitlement. Similarly, historical apologies and Indigenous reconciliation initiatives for past wrongs are also instruments to perpetuate the colonial Canadian state and advance a program of assimilation and cultural erasure.

A BIPOLAR RELATIONSHIP

This article explores the specific role colonialism plays as a communication tradition in Canada, and how empirical beliefs enabled settler occupation of Vancouver 131 years ago. The research work I am doing now analyzes the role of pan-nativism and liberal multiculturalism in dominant settler cultural policy, both of which promote Coast Salish cultural erasure and obfuscate opportunities for redress. At odds with Coast Salish nationhood tendencies, dominant settler culture and communications frame unique and diverse Indigenous cultures as cultural tourism commodities to enact a notion that an “Indigenous Canada” exists. A consequence of this bipolar relationship to Coast Salish culture by colonial governments and mainstream cultural institutions is that Coast Salish culture is structurally underfunded, lacks development, and is neglected until it is needed by these same governments and institutions to raise massive budgets for marquee events and charades of inclusivity.

The premise that all who live within Canada’s borders can share equally in its riches is in conflict with genuine reconciliation and requires silent adherence to Canada’s white supremacist roots. Throughout Canada in 2017, tightly scripted birthday celebrations were held to inculcate colonialism through highly choreographed displays of public unity fuelled by almost half a billion dollars for reconciliation-themed programs (Hannay, 2017). The boundaries of Indigenous participants’ sovereignty and their collusion and adherence to colonialism were inevitably blurred.

THE RECONCILIATION INDUSTRY

From Chief Bobby Joseph to Gord Downie, Canadians were invited through powerful individual stories to participate in reconciliation healing activities, but only one side showed up to do work, and it was Indigenous people. Their healing labour was offered to “fix” the colonial mistakes, while at the same time, reminiscent of Dallas Smythe’s “On the Audience Commodity and Its Work” (1981), the labour of marginalized participants was used to deliver “healing” as well as desired outcomes for elites. The victims’ labour enabled the broadcasting of the reconciliation process to millions via social media, communicating a discourse of healing and recovery within the colonial apparatus, suggesting that Indigenous people can now “move on.” But moving on, in this scenario, means accepting reconciliation without genuine redress or restitution. Through Canada’s version of truth seeking, dominant settler society is not required to provide labour or time and can enjoy the fact that national policies (represented as “cultural genocide” by Canadian standards) get an easy reconciliation with the victims (Staniforth, 2015).

In a broadcast radio interview, Pam Palmater told me: “Reconciliation is fluff. It is also becoming an industry. I have noticed that businesses are now including reconciliation as if it is a 5-star gold rating” (Oostindie, 2016). Indigenous peoples’ difference and self-representations are appropriated by the Canadian national meta-narrative. Even the fact that these representations often render a radical critique of the dominant culture is taken as further evidence of a centrist design to demonstrate the putative tolerance of the dominant society (Osborne, 2001).

The problem for the Canada 150+ festival was putting icing on a cake before the cake had been baked. Quantitative data analysis of the state of Coast Salish culture and representation, as well as Canada Council funding levels, reveal a cultural sector in crisis when compared with non-Coast Salish settler culture operating in the Vancouver area. Indigenous artists inadvertently advance the colonial goal of liberal pan-nativism and Coast Salish erasure by taking up

BY IRWIN OOSTINDIE*

Irwin Oostindie is a Dutch/Canadian media artist and researcher who has led international and local media and culture projects for three decades. Currently he is a graduate student at Simon Fraser University exploring the redressing of settler cultural policy in the era of reconciliation.

* As a Dutch settler living and learning about the history of the peoples on whose unceded lands I am living, I am gratefully indebted for the patience and generosity of many Coast Salish individuals who have shared both with me. I attempt this writing to educate my colleagues and comrades on the roles and responsibilities of settlers to lift up Coast Salish culture.
public space through arts festivals and venues that have no Coast Salish cultural policies. Only one out of about 10,000 artists exhibiting in the Vancouver Art Gallery, the region’s premier public arts institution, has been Coast Salish. As for Canada Council funding, 97 percent of Indigenous-targeted funding going into Metro Vancouver goes to non-Coast Salish artists. Of the entirety of Canada Council funding going into Metro Vancouver, 99.98 percent does not go to Coast Salish culture (Low, 2016).

FESTIVAL CULTURE
When it is not blended with Indigenous culture from across Canada, the Coast Salish culture resurgence is hyper-commodified, fetishized, and packaged for the notion of Aboriginal cultural tourism. This takes place at the arrival gates of the Vancouver International Airport, in the 2010 Olympics artwork, and in Canada 150+ celebrations. Coast Salish culture apart from that receives little structural and ongoing funding. The settler state’s motivation to spend on First Nation governments’ complicity in marquee events is summarized by Glen Coulthard: “what is treated in the Canadian discourse of reconciliation as an unhealthy and debilitating incapacity to forgive and move on is actually a sign of critical consciousness, of our sense of injustice, and of our awareness of and unwillingness to reconcile” (Coulthard, 2014).

While appearing to promote Indigenous cultural resurgence, settler cultural practices instead cherry-pick when and how they use Coast Salish culture to adorn its festivals and events. Until landmarks are returned to their rightful Coast Salish place names, and settler society moves beyond the liberal instrument of territorial acknowledgments, and colonial governments work for genuine reconciliation and redress, and the Coast Salish are held up by dominant culture as the legitimate cultural heroes of their unceded lands and waters, Canada shall be merely the forever colonial wild west.
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Dangers of Exclusion and Appropriation

Indigenous peoples are distinguished from others for being “Indigenous to the land they inhabit” (Alfred & Comtasssel, 2005, p. 598) for having ways of life attached to this initial connection with the land and having to defy contemporary forms of colonization. Worldwide, Indigenous people are forming alliances, suggesting that sharing an Indigenous identity and experiences of colonialism can contribute to decolonizing collaboration among Indigenous populations (Aylwin, 2008; Smith, 2012). This article explores how similar decolonizing collaborations can take place between Aboriginal peoples and Indigenous immigrants. It has been argued that racialized immigrants, including Indigenous immigrants, do not accept their involvement in colonialism as settlers while experiencing systemic racism themselves (Byrd, 2011; Lawrence & Dua, 2005; Tuck & Yang, 2012). This has resulted in anti-racist discourses that exclude Aboriginal people and their experiences (Lawrence & Dua, 2008). Although this problem needs to be addressed by non-Aboriginal people, it has often been ignored (Regan, 2010; Thobani, 2007). With this article, I hope to address the Truth and Reconciliation Commission’s calls to action, which enlist non-Aboriginal people in Canada to embrace the responsibility of building partnerships with Aboriginal peoples (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2012). In the process, I analyze the dangers of appropriation in my position relative to Aboriginal worldviews.

There is some existing literature on the relationships between racialized immigrants and Aboriginal peoples (Bohacker & Iacovetta, 2009; Ghorayshi, 2010). However, there is no information about Indigenous immigrants living in Canada and their relations with Aboriginal peoples. The Indigenous populations involved in this research are Quechua and Aboriginal peoples in Canada. Quechua peoples are Indigenous groups consisting of the Incas, Chancas, Huancas, and Cañaris, who live mainly in the Andes of South America (Waddington, 2016), whereas First Nations, Métis, and Inuit (FNMI) constitute the Aboriginal peoples living in Canada (National Household Survey, 2011).

My engagement with Indigenous people in this research is deeply influenced by my positionality, which involves being Peruvian born and Mestiza (having Quechua and European, mainly Spanish, roots). I chose to discuss collaboration of Quechua immigrants with Aboriginal peoples because I have not observed discussions on this topic within my own ethnic community, even though that is the expectation. As well, it is of personal benefit for me to collaborate on the well-being of Aboriginal peoples as I have two daughters who are Aboriginal.

The Knower

My worldviews are shaped by my experiences of colonization in my homelands and my immigration to a colonized country; my presence helps prop up the colonization of FNMI peoples (Lawrence & Dua, 2008). As I engage with Quechua and Aboriginal worldviews and epistemologies, my positionality is unsettling. I have lived in Canada for many years and have lost aspects of my Mestiza roots. Therefore, I consider myself an insider/outsider researcher within Quechua communities. On issues concerning Aboriginal communities, I clearly have an outsider’s perspective. Similarly, depending on who “the knower” is, the knowledge shared will vary (Mignolo, 2009). Within Indigenous worldviews, “the knowers” include all the cosmos, whereas in mainstream research practices, there is a power imbalance embedded in who is allowed to be the knower (Hardings, 1987). This comparison illustrates the need to move away from Eurocentric frameworks such as ethnography, which rely on ways of knowing that are fairly different from Indigenous ways of knowing.

The proposed forms of collaboration between non-Aboriginal and Aboriginal peoples are founded on the principle that non-Aboriginal peoples “experience settler privileges on Turtle Island” (Koleszar-Green, 2016). Awareness of their settler position and what this entails is important in making non-Aboriginal peoples assume responsibility in the restoration of Aboriginal communities (Keefer, 2010). Collaboration with Aboriginal peoples would involve transformation of the current structures in place (Swamp, 2010). To partake in this collaboration, allies would need to engage in the inner work as described above, as well as reflect on how one’s positionality influences collaboration with Aboriginal peoples (Swamp, 2010; Davis, 2010).
THE FOCUS OF COLLABORATION

Collaboration of racialized immigrants with Aboriginal peoples could be partly hindered by their different focus. Whereas anti-racist concepts of collaboration focus on equality among groups that have excluded Aboriginal populations, Aboriginal activists focus on sovereignty of Aboriginal peoples and repatriation of Indigenous lands and life (Lawrence & Dua, 2005; Gkisedtanamoogk, 2010; Tuck and Yang, 2012; Koleszar-Green, 2016). In response, Tuck and Yang’s (2012) model of contingent collaboration claims that collaborating with Aboriginal peoples means accepting their views on decolonization. The collaborative relationships will remain as long as they are effective, and they could stop at any time when they no longer work.

Koleszar-Green’s (2016) interpretation of the Two-Row Wampum Belt offers guiding principles for the relationships between Aboriginal peoples and settlers. According to Koleszar-Green, “the belt is made up of three rows of white beads separated by two rows of purple beads. The purple beads represent two vessels (one canoe and the other a ship) that travel the same river without interfering with each other” (Koleszar-Green, 2016, p. 31, from her personal communication with elders Sakioeta and Tewantahawitha, September 22, 2013). White beads symbolize peace, friendship, and mutual respect, and they are the values supporting collaborative relationships (Koleszar-Green, 2016). The Two-Row Wampum Belt represents the responsibilities of both the “guest” (settler) and the “host” (Indigenous person) for making the relationship itself more collaborative.

A prophetical view on collaboration is offered through prophecies such as “The Eagle and the Condor,” told by various Indigenous groups such as the Incas. According to the prophecy, a transformation would happen around this time when the Condor unites with the Eagle: “this will give birth to a new spirit. This new spirit will unite once again the red nations of North, Central and South parts of the hemisphere” (Eagle and the Condor Coordinating Council). This prophetic joining of forces among Indigenous nations in America is already taking place among Indigenous people in America.

The application of these collaborative approaches to Quechua immigrants involves having Quechua immigrant recognize that they are contributing to the colonization of Aboriginal peoples. This is the case, regardless of the conditions that brought them to these lands (Dhamoon, 2015). At the same time, to engage in collaboration, Quechua immigrants may also need to engage in healing. For instance, the hardships of holding marginalized identities as Indigenous in their homelands and Indigenous immigrants in Canada would need to be addressed. This cannot be the responsibility of Aboriginal peoples, yet it is a crucial step toward reaching collaboration. As I move forward with this research, I hope to learn more about the awareness that racialized immigrants, particularly Quechua immigrants, have on their identities as settlers and the responsibilities that this entails. Addressing such questions is a step toward finding a connection among Indigenous immigrants and Aboriginal peoples in Canada that so far has been dismissed. ♣
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Colonialism vs. truth and reconciliation

ROOTS OF THE CHILD WELFARE SYSTEM IN MANITOBA

In 2017, Canada celebrated 150 years of existence. An existence based on the dispossession of Indigenous people and on the idea that settlers had the inherent right to claim land and resources. Colonialism persists due in part to the reluctance of potential allies to engage in the process of reconciliation because it is difficult and uncomfortable; however, those who benefit from the marginalization of oppressed people must also participate in reconciliation; otherwise, it cannot be successful. Colonialism abides today in the laws that erode Indigenous rights regarding land, status, basic human rights, and most notably the child welfare system, which has removed thousands of Indigenous children from their families and communities (Council of the Federation Secretariat, 2015, p. 7). This article provides a brief examination of the current state of overrepresentation of Indigenous children in foster care in Manitoba. It suggests that the current child welfare system in the province serves to isolate these children from their families and cultures, and it asserts that proposed changes to the system in the province are a step toward reconciliation.

To understand child welfare in Manitoba, we must first touch on the history of residential schools in Canada. Residential schools were a tool of colonialism, a means of assimilating Indigenous people into settler society, removing barriers to land and resources that had not yet been possessed by settlers (Barker, 2014; Crosby & Monaghan, 2017). Indigenous children were transported to school locations that were often unknown to their families, and were forbidden from speaking their own languages. “Children were abused, physically, and sexually, and they died in the schools in numbers that would not have been tolerated in any school system anywhere in the country, or the world” (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2015a, p. v). There were many more students who survived residential school, but they lived with dysfunction, grief, and despair as a result of the abuse they suffered at the hands of the priests, nuns, and teachers who ran the schools (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2015b).

CHILD WELFARE TODAY

In Manitoba and across Canada, the child welfare system is considered to be an iteration of the residential school system, and the overrepresentation of Indigenous children in foster care “has its roots in the historical disadvantages experienced by Indigenous peoples, including the negative effects of colonization and the inter-generational impact of the residential school system which separated children from their families and subjected many children to maltreatment” (Brownell et al., 2015, p. xi). In this sense, colonialism continues to have a strong effect on Indigenous families in Manitoba through the child welfare system, which negatively impacts Indigenous families at statistically higher rates than any other culture in Canada. The 2011 National Household Survey (Statistics Canada, 2013) found that only 23 percent of Manitoba children are Indigenous, yet as of March 31, 2016, 87.6 percent of the 10,501 children in care in Manitoba were Indigenous (Manitoba Family Services, 2016, p. 92).

Indigenous children often come into care for reasons related to neglect (failure to provide proper care) rather than abuse (physical or psychological maltreatment). Incidents of neglect in child welfare are closely linked to poverty rates, which are higher for Indigenous people both on and off reserve than for non-Indigenous people (Assembly of First Nations, 2009, p. 37). Poverty contributes to the neglect of children because, statistically, “children from low income families are many times more likely to experience neglect” (Council of the Federation Secretariat, 2015, p. 11). Indigenous families living in poverty on and off reserve are more likely to derive their primary source of income from social assistance or other government benefits and are less likely to have caregivers who are employed full time (Sinha et al., 2013). “These households [are] also more likely to face the challenges to providing the assets which foster healthy child development which are linked to low incomes associated with social assistance/employment insurance/other benefits as the primary income source” (Sinha et al., 2013, p. 62). Today, Indigenous children and youth in care in Manitoba face marked grief and isolation from their families, communities, and cultures (Office of the Children’s Advocate, 2016). They are expected to transition to new environments with little or no guidance from the adults in their lives, and they experience childhoods impacted by a lack of secure relationships with caring adults and guardians, often as a result of multiple placement moves (Office of the Children’s Advocate, 2016).

The experience of Indigenous children, youth, and their families in Canada is an overwhelming challenge to the process of truth and reconciliation. Hope for healthy Indigenous families cannot become a reality as long as the structural issue of poverty continues to be ignored. All Canadians, whether they work in child welfare or not, must insist at all levels of government that the root causes of neglect-driven child welfare interventions be addressed with judi-
ciously applied social programs that keep Indigenous people from living in abject poverty. Child welfare issues such as neglect due to poverty can no longer be the sole responsibility of an overburdened system that was created to remove Indigenous children from their families and did not address the root causes of the concerns that bring Indigenous families to the attention of agencies (Blackstock & Trocmé, 2005). Children should not be coming into care because their families are poor; rather, families should be “provided with the economic and social supports necessary to safely care for their children and youth” (Blackstock et al., 2006, p. 11).

CHILD WELFARE TODAY: PREVENTION AND PARTICIPATION

Currently, the Manitoba government is moving toward providing child welfare agencies in the province with block funding that would enable agencies to spend money on prevention services with families, instead of funding agencies based on the number of children removed from their families (Malone, 2017). Prevention services include traditional Indigenous customary care arrangements and community-based prevention models. Other possible solutions include community consultations, promoting legal guardianship outside the child welfare system, and reunification through the family group conferencing model, which has experienced success with Indigenous populations in both Australia and in Manitoba, and more funding for intervention and prevention services from the province (Malone, 2017). There are many paths toward reconciliation in Canada, but the commonalities they share are that they must be Indigenous-led with full participation and support from non-Indigenous citizens and all levels of government.

Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples must “acknowledge and accept responsibility for redressing the wrongs done to Indigenous children, youth, families, and communities, regardless of their degree of direct involvement” (Blackstock et al., 2006, p. 9) and commit to working together toward improved outcomes for Indigenous families involved in child welfare systems. Non-Indigenous Canadians must remember that their assumptions regarding the oppression of Indigenous people are not without bias when they attempt to absolve themselves of responsibility for reconciliation. As Canada celebrates 150 years of Confederation, it is important that citizens become conscious of the ways in which colonial laws, “Canadian values,” and the stories we tell ourselves about the history of our country negate the suffering and oppression that Indigenous people continue to experience (Denis & Bailey, 2016).

NOTES

1. In 2011, for the first time, the National Household Survey counted foster children in each household, and found that there were 29,590 children in care across Canada (Statistics Canada, 2013).
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Non-Indigenous Canadians must remember that their assumptions regarding the oppression of Indigenous people are not without bias when they attempt to absolve themselves of responsibility for reconciliation.
my paper. That conference was fairly informal. It was held in Thompson Hall, the graduate centre, but it was a wonderful and positive experience.

With that in mind, I wanted to build up the Robarts graduate conference initiative, launched under my predecessor, to provide a similar opportunity for graduate students to experience their first conference, with an eye to offering students a more professional experience in a supportive and nurturing setting.

To that end, the annual graduate student conference follows the traditional conference format, with a call for papers, a 12-15 minute presentation, and an opportunity to revise and submit for publication, thereby making it as real a conference experience as possible.

At the Robarts Centre we are fortunate to be able to draw on a wide array of faculty associates who also participate in the conference by reading the student papers, providing feedback, and acting as discussants on the various panels. Having discussants contributes to the professional element of the conference and gives students a real feeling for how conferences function.

Finally, as this edition of Canada Watch demonstrates, the final stage is publishing a selection of papers presented at the conference, thereby giving students the final goal of turning a paper into a publication. We are so excited to share with you some of the wonderful work being produced by these amazing graduate students.

As the conference enters its fifth year, we are excited to see more and more students apply to participate as we continue to cultivate a reputation as the premier place for graduate research and the graduate conference that students want to attend.

We are indebted to the endowment fund that enables the Centre to finance the conference and to subsidize students travel costs, thereby increasing the accessibility to students from across the country. We are thankful for the work and engagement of our support staff, faculty, and students who make the conference such a success each year. Overall, as the director of the Robarts Centre, I am pleased to see the way that the graduate conference continues to grow and thrive and remind us that the study of Canada is alive and well. I am particularly proud to see the way the conference provides an important academic, learning, and professional opportunity for so many graduate students. With that in mind, please enjoy yet another stellar edition of Canada Watch.

---

Transgressing the nation-state

...tions." Relaying the heartbreaking account of Adam Capay, an Indigenous man who was kept in solitary confinement for four years, O’Connor outlines the controversial use of confinement in the Canadian justice system, and its disproportionate use within the systemic mistreatment of First Nations prisoners. Next, Irwin Oostindie also engages the problems of Canada’s policy development as it relates to First Nations peoples. Through direct reference to the celebrations of Canada’s confederacy, his essay “Anniversaries of Denial: Canada 150 and the Impacts of Settler Cultural Policy” interrogates the problematic nature of colonial celebrations as an entrenchment and camouflaging of ongoing applications of policy that erases Indigenous culture.

With these continuing legacies of colonialism, how is reconciliation even remotely possible? In our last two essays, the authors confront the potentials and pitfalls of such an endeavour. In “Conceptualizing Collaboration Between Indigenous Racialized Immigrants and Aboriginal Peoples,” Brenda Polar describes the alliances that Indigenous peoples worldwide have formed in an attempt to contribute to decolonization. While immigrant populations often experience similar systemic racism, they also contribute to some of the problems of erasure that erode Indigenous culture. Polar addresses this dichotomy and explores the potential collaborations that might ensue. Finally, in “Colonialism vs. Truth and Reconciliation,” Ada Uddoh considers how the legacy of colonialism persists in our legal and governmental systems. In particular, she describes the child welfare system, which has been vigorously criticized for the removal of First Nations children from their parents during the “Sixties scoop.” As in any other colonial system, change occurs slowly, and despite the renunciation of this policy, First Nations peoples are still overrepresented in foster care. Where does such a broken system go from here? Uddoh outlines a few of the proposed changes to the Manitoba welfare system that seek to take steps toward reconciliation.

Together, these essays conclude that the Canadian legacy is deeply entrenched by social and economic inequalities along lines of gender, race, indigeneity, ability, region, socio-economic status, and migration status, among others. As we struggle with the lack of justice for Colten Boushie and Tina Fontaine, along with the numerous missing and murdered Indigenous women, there is no better time to reflect on the fact that some Canadians are confined within the constructs of Canadian identity.
Temporary foreign worker status continued from page 8
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Travelling with Father Morin continued from page 12

*Revue internationale d'études québécoises* 16.

9. So named for their long, white robes, not out of any sense of historical irony.


26. See, particularly, Foisy, “Des Québécois aux frontières.”
Monstrous bodies, mad minds

continued from page 18

Métis scholar Jo-Ann Episkenew when she states that “the creative process has restorative powers” (2009, p. 68). In order “to heal the wounds of oppression, and to reconcile our communities” (Episkenew, 2009, p. 194), writing must not dance around the issue of trauma in any of its forms—psychological, physical, linguistic—and must instead strive to write “liberating' madness” through texts (Felman, 2003, p. 15). Ongoing trauma is an unavoidable fact of postcolonial realities, as made obvious in Marlene’s resounding “Yes” in response to Brand’s question of “did we, did you go crazy after?” (2001, p. 169). Writing the “crazy” thus becomes a political and emancipatory act, in denying the forgetting of violation and madness in all its forms.
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Indigenous immigrants

continued from page 28

relationships (pp. 77-90), Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
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City Builders

The City Builders project aims to record, examine, and divulge the history of Toronto’s immigrant construction workers after the Second World War through filmed oral history interviews, photographs of participant’s personal records and artifacts, and extensive research in Toronto’s archives. We are interviewing forty retired members of the Laborers International Union of North America’s Local 183, focusing on their goals, struggles, achievements, and thoughts on immigration, construction work, labour organization, Toronto, and other topics of significance for our interviewees. A multimedia exhibition will launch with the 2018 Avie Bennett Conference at York University, taking place on September 2018. All of the materials gathered and produced by this project will be donated to the Clara Thomas Archives and Special Collections, York University Libraries, once the project is completed.


Women in Sustainable Energy Research (WISER) is a grassroots network connecting women researchers in clean energy (PhD Candidates, Post Docs and Professors) to contribute towards a generous mode of knowledge production through professional development, collaboration and networking. Most recently, WISER hosted an Op-ed and Media Training workshop with Shari Graydon from Informed Opinions. Furthermore, through our website and member profiles, WISER acts as a resource that institutions, researchers and the public can draw upon.

WISER is currently supported through partnerships with Women in Renewable Energy (WiRE) and is sponsored by the Waterloo Institute of Sustainable Energy (WISE). Our administrative home is located in the Robarts Centre for Canadian Studies at York University.

Women scholars in clean energy research are encouraged to join WISER by visiting our website and filling out our membership form.
The concept of environmental justice (or injustice) refers generally to the inequitable distribution of the costs and benefits of environmental degradation, such that people of colour and the poor tend to bear a significantly greater portion of the costs, while receiving relatively little in terms of any benefits. In Canada, environmental (in)justice is a constant undercurrent for arguably most (if not all) environmental challenges that Indigenous peoples face. The field of environmental justice studies, therefore, forms a critical theoretical and applied framework for addressing key environmental issues of concern to Indigenous peoples in Canada. To date, however, research focused on Indigenous environmental justice (EJ) has not yet occurred in a substantive way in Canada. Furthermore, if EJ studies are to benefit Indigenous communities, then they must include knowledge, principles and values already held and practiced by Indigenous peoples. 